STATEMENT OF GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY; ACCOMPANIED BY LT. GEN. WILLIAM CASSIDY, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, AND BRIG. GEN. HARRY G. WOODBURY, DIRECTOR OF CIVIL WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

General Johnson. Mr. Chairman, as Chief of Staff of the Army, I oppose enactment of that part of S. 886 that would transfer the civil works functions of the Army Engineers to a Department of Natural Resources. I believe the transfer would be Jahren and collaboration in the combat zones, in the communications areas, and in the mobilization support areas in the United States are critical to the Army's effective performance.

Our mobilization rate is dependent in part on qualified engineers, trained, organized and in being, with experience as a part of the military team, who are prepared to expand our posts and training facili-

ties, and to man our combat and combat-support units.

It is important that construction support be available when it is needed. It must be large enough and flexible enough to meet a wide range of conditions. It is upon the Corps of Engineers that the Army relies to provide that support. The Army Engineers are an essential part of the military team that is necessary to meet our needs in the United States and in those external areas where the United States has commitments.

## ADVANTAGES OF ARMY'S CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM

The total Army Engineers capability in the United States is divided roughly into 75 percent civil activities and 25 percent military activities. The total organization operates under the control of the Army, is experienced in Army procedures, and is three penalty to midgen common of the Alaskan earthquake, Operation Noah in New England in 1955 and Hurricane Betsy in the gulf in 1965.